UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)		
v.) JOHN PERRY,) JOSEPH BURHOE,) JAMES DEAMICIS and) THOMAS FLAHERTY,) Defendants.)	Criminal Action No.	12-10293
VERDICT FORM		
WE, THE JURY, UNANIMOUSLY FIND:		
As to COUNT ONE (Racketeering), we unanimously find:		
Defendant JOHN PERRY	Guilty	Not Guilty
Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	Guilty	Not Guilty
Defendant JAMES DEAMICIS	Guilty	Not Guilty
Defendant THOMAS FLAHERTY	Guilty	Not Guilty
If you found any defendant(s) guilty as to Count 1 Racketeering Acts you unanimously find the government last to that defendant(s):		
Racketeering Act No. 1: (Conspiracy to Extort Employer Entities)		
Defendant JOHN PERRY	Proven	Not Proven
Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	Proven	Not Proven

Defendant JAMES DEAMICIS		
	Proven	Not Proven
Defendant THOMAS FLAHERTY		/
	Proven	Not Proven
Racketeering Act No. 2: (Extortion of Four Pints, LLC)		
Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	/	
	Proven	Not Proven
Racketeering Act No. 3: (Extortion of Rafanelli Events and Brigham & Women's I	Hospital)	
Defendant JOHN PERRY		V -
	Proven	Not Proven
Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	/	
	Proven	Not Proven
Racketeering Act No. 4: (Extortion of Sebastian's Café & Catering and Best of Bos	ston)	
Defendant JOHN PERRY		
	Proven	Not Proven
Defendant JAMES DEAMICIS		
	Proven	Not Proven
Racketeering Act No. 5: (Extortion of U.S. Green Building Council and Wolfgang	Puck)	
Defendant JOHN PERRY		
	Proven	Not Proven
Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE		
	Proven	Not Proven
Racketeering Act No. 6: (Extortion of Novartis and The Westin Waterfront Hotel)		
Defendant JOHN PERRY		
	Proven	Not Proven
Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE		
	Proven	Not Proven

I	Defendant JAMES DEAMICIS		
		Proven	Not Proven
Racketeering Ad (Attempted Exte	ct No. 7: ortion of Live Nation)		
Ι	Defendant JAMES DEAMICIS	Proven	Not Proven
Ι	Defendant THOMAS FLAHERTY	Proven	Not Proven
Racketeering Ad (Attempted Exte	ct No. 8: ortion of Massachusetts Democratic Party)		
Ι	Defendant JOHN PERRY	Proven	$\frac{\checkmark}{\text{Not Proven}}$
Ι	Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	Proven	Not Proven
Γ	Defendant JAMES DEAMICIS	Proven	Not Proven
Γ	Defendant THOMAS FLAHERTY	Proven	Not Proven
Racketeering Ac (Extortion of Ma	ct No. 9: assachusetts General Hospital)		
Ι	Defendant JOHN PERRY	Proven	Not Proven
Ι	Defendant JAMES DEAMICIS	Proven	Not Proven
Racketeering Ac (Extortion of Th	ct No. 10: ne Westin Copley Hotel)		
Ι	Defendant JOHN PERRY	Proven	Not Proven
Ι	Defendant JAMES DEAMICIS	Proven	Not Proven

	ering Act No. 11: on of The Great Bridal Show and The Westin V	Waterfront Hotel)	
	Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	/	
		Proven	Not Proven
	ering Act No. 12(a): racy to Extort – Manipulation of Contract Rati	fication Votes)	
(1)	as to wages and employee benefits:		
	Defendant JOHN PERRY	Proven	Not Proven
	Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	Proven	Not Proven
	Defendant JAMES DEAMICIS		
		Proven	Not Proven
	Defendant THOMAS FLAHERTY		
		Proven	Not Proven
		nswer section (2) of	Racketeering Act No
(2)	as to the rights of Local 82 members to der labor organization as guaranteed by the LM		n in the affairs of thei
	Defendant JOHN PERRY	/	

	ring Act No. 12(b): n – Manipulation of Contract Ratification V	otes)	
(1)	as to wages and employee benefits:		
	Defendant JOHN PERRY	Proven	Not Proven
	Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	Proven	Not Proven
	Defendant JAMES DEAMICIS	Proven	Not Proven
	Defendant THOMAS FLAHERTY	Proven	Not Proven
	Thether or not you found that the governments bsection (1) of Racketeering Act No. 12(b), actions:	•	•
(2)	as to the rights of Local 82 members to de labor organization as guaranteed by the LN		in the affairs of their
	Defendant JOHN PERRY	Proven	Not Proven
	Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	Proven	Not Proven
	Defendant JAMES DEAMICIS	Proven	Not Proven
	Defendant THOMAS FLAHERTY	Proven	Not Proven
	ring Act No. 13: n of Edward Flaherty and Other Local 82 Me	embers)	
(1)	as to wages and employee benefits:		
	Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	Proven	Not Proven

Whether or not you found that the government has proven or not proven the conduct under subsection (1) of Racketeering Act No. 13, answer section (2) of Racketeering Act No. 13 below:

(2)	as to the rights of Local 82 members to demo labor organization as guaranteed by the LMRI		ne affairs of their
	Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE		
		Proven	Not Proven
	ring Act No. 14: n of Edward Flaherty and Other Local 82 Memb	pers)	
(1)	as to wages and employee benefits:		
	Defendant JOHN PERRY	Proven	Not Proven
	Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	Proven	Not Proven
	hether or not you found that the government osection (1) of Racketeering Act No. 14, answer		
(2)	as to the rights of Local 82 members to demo labor organization as guaranteed by the LMRI		ne affairs of their
	Defendant JOHN PERRY	Proven	Not Proven
	Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	Proven	Not Proven
	ring Act No. 15: n of James Lee and Other Local 82 Members)		
(1)	as to wages and employee benefits:		
	Defendant JOHN PERRY	Proven	Not Proven

Whether or not you found that the government has proven or not proven the conduct under subsection (1) of Racketeering Act No. 15, answer section (2) of Racketeering Act No. 15 below:

(2) as to the rights of Local 82 members to democratic participation in the affairs of their labor organization as guaranteed by the LMRDA:

Def	endant JOHN PERRY		
		Proven	Not Proven
Racketeering Act 1	No. 16:		
_	rt Wellman and Other Local 82 Me	mbers)	
`		,	
(1) as to wa	ages and employee benefits:		
5	C 1 LOIDIDEDDY	/	
D	efendant JOHN PERRY	<u></u>	
		Proven	Not Proven
		,	
D	efendant JOSEPH BURHOE		
		Proven	Not Proven

Whether or not you found that the government has proven or not proven the conduct under subsection (1) of Racketeering Act No. 16, answer section (2) of Racketeering Act No. 16 below:

(2) as to the rights of Local 82 members to democratic participation in the affairs of their labor organization as guaranteed by the LMRDA:

Defendant JOHN PERRY	Proven	Not Proven
Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	Proven	Not Proven

As to Count TWO (Racketeering Conspiracy), we unanimously find:

Defendant JOHN PERRY	Guilty	Not Guilty
Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	Guilty	Not Guilty
Defendant JAMES DEAMICIS	Guilty	Not Guilty
Defendant THOMAS FLAHERTY	Guilty	Not Guilty

As to Count THREE (Conspiracy to Extort Employer	Entities), we unanim	nously find:
Defendant JOHN PERRY	_/_	
	Guilty	Not Guilty
Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE		
	Guilty	Not Guilty
Defendant JAMES DEAMICIS		
	Guilty	Not Guilty
Defendant THOMAS FLAHERTY	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
	Guilty	Not Guilty
As to Count FOUR (Extortion of Four Pints, LLC), we Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	e unanimously find: Guilty	Not Guilty
As to Count FIVE (Extortion of Rafanelli Events and I unanimously find:	Brigham & Women'	s Hospital), we
Defendant JOHN PERRY		
Daniel Com v Danie	Guilty	Not Guilty
		•
Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	Guilty	Not Guilty
As to Count SIX (Extortion of Sebastian's Café & Catunanimously find:	ering and Best of Bo	oston), we
Defendant JOHN PERRY	C-:16-	Not Codle
	Guilty	Not Guilty
Defendant JAMES DEAMICIS		
	Guilty	Not Guilty
As to Count SEVEN (Extortion of U.S. Green Busunanimously find:	ilding Council and	Wolfgang Puck), we
Defendant JOHN PERRY		/
Determent Contract	Guilty	Not Guilty
	-	•

	Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	Guilty	Not Guilty
As to Count find:	EIGHT (Extortion of Novartis and The W	estin Waterfront Hot	el), we unanimously
	Defendant JOHN PERRY	Guilty	Not Guilty
	Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	Guilty	Not Guilty
	Defendant JAMES DEAMICIS	Guilty	Not Guilty
As to Count	NINE (Attempted Extortion of Live Natio	n), we unanimously	find:
	Defendant JAMES DEAMICIS	Guilty	Not Guilty
	Defendant THOMAS FLAHERTY	Guilty	Not Guilty
As to Count find:	TEN (Attempted Extortion of Massachuse	etts Democratic Party), we unanimously
	Defendant JOHN PERRY	Guilty	Not Guilty
	Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	Guilty	Not Guilty
	Defendant JAMES DEAMICIS	Guilty	Not Guilty
	Defendant THOMAS FLAHERTY	Guilty	Not Guilty
As to Count	ELEVEN (Extortion of Massachusetts Ge	neral Hospital), we u	nanimously find:
	Defendant JOHN PERRY	Guilty	Not Guilty

Defendant JAMES DEAMICIS	Guilty	Not Guilty
As to Count TWELVE (Extortion of The Westin Cople	y Hotel), we unanimo	usly find:
Defendant JOHN PERRY	Guilty	Not Guilty
Defendant JAMES DEAMICIS	Guilty	Not Guilty
As to Count THIRTEEN (Extortion of The Great Bridal Hotel), we unanimously find:	Show and The Westi	n Waterfront
Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	Guilty	Not Guilty
As to Count FOURTEEN (Conspiracy to Extort – Maniwe unanimously find:	pulation of Contract R	Ratification Votes),
(1) as to wages and employee benefits:		
Defendant JOHN PERRY	Guilty	Not Guilty
Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	Guilty	Not Guilty
Defendant JAMES DEAMICIS	Guilty	Not Guilty
Defendant THOMAS FLAHERTY	Guilty	Not Guilty
Whether or not you found that the government under subsection (1) of Count FOURTEEN, answer section		
(2) as to the rights of Local 82 members to dem labor organization as guaranteed by the LMF		n the affairs of their
Defendant JOHN PERRY	Guilty	Not Guilty

Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	Guilty	Not Guilty			
Defendant JAMES DEAMICIS	Guilty	Not Guilty			
Defendant THOMAS FLAHER	Guilty	Not Guilty			
As to Count FIFTEEN (Extortion – Manipulation of Contract Ratification Votes), we unanimously find:					
(1) as to wages and employee benefits:					
Defendant JOHN PERRY	Guilty	Not Guilty			
Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	Guilty	Not Guilty			
Defendant JAMES DEAMICIS	Guilty	Not Guilty			
Defendant THOMAS FLAHER	TY Guilty	Not Guilty			
Whether or not you found that the government has proven or not proven the conduct under subsection (1) of Count FIFTEEN, answer section (2) of Count FIFTEEN below:					
(2) as to the rights of Local 82 members to democratic participation in the affairs of their labor organization as guaranteed by the LMRDA:					
Defendant JOHN PERRY	Guilty	Not Guilty			
Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	Guilty	Not Guilty			
Defendant JAMES DEAMICIS	Guilty	Not Guilty			
Defendant THOMAS FLAHER	TY Guilty	Not Guilty			

	unt SIXTEEN (Extortion of Edward Flaher usly find:	ty and Other Local 82 N	Members), we
(1)	as to wages and employee benefits:		
	Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	Guilty	Not Guilty
	Thether or not you found that the governibsection (1) of Count SIXTEEN, answer sec		
(2)	as to the rights of Local 82 members to clabor organization as guaranteed by the I		in the affairs of their
	Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	Guilty	Not Guilty
	unt SEVENTEEN (Extortion of Edward Flausly find:	aherty and Other Local	82 Members), we
(1)	as to wages and employee benefits:		
	Defendant JOHN PERRY	Guilty	Not Guilty
	Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	Guilty	Not Guilty
	Thether or not you found that the governibsection (1) of Count SEVENTEEN, answer	-	-
(2)	as to the rights of Local 82 members to clabor organization as guaranteed by the I		in the affairs of their
	Defendant JOHN PERRY	Guilty	Not Guilty
	Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	Guilty	Not Guilty

	Count EIGHTEEN (Extortion of James usly find:	Lee and Other Local	82 Members), we
(1)	as to wages and employee benefits:		
	Defendant JOHN PERRY	Guilty	Not Guilty
	Thether or not you found that the governi bsection (1) of Count EIGHTEEN, answer s	-	•
(2)	as to the rights of Local 82 members to clabor organization as guaranteed by the I		in the affairs of their
	Defendant JOHN PERRY	Guilty	Not Guilty
	unt NINETEEN (Extortion of Robert Wellr usly find:	man and Other Local 82	Members), we
(1)	as to wages and employee benefits:	,	
	Defendant JOHN PERRY	Guilty	Not Guilty
	Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	Guilty	Not Guilty
	Thether or not you found that the governibsection (1) of Count NINETEEN, answer s		
(2)	as to the rights of Local 82 members to clabor organization as guaranteed by the I		in the affairs of their
	Defendant JOHN PERRY	Guilty	Not Guilty
	Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE	Guilty	Not Guilty

Case 1:12-cr-10293-DJC Document 552 Filed 11/19/14 Page 14 of 14

As to Count TWENTY (Prohibition Against Certain Persons Holding Office), we unanimously find:

Defendant JOHN PERRY

Guilty

Not Guilty

Defendant JOSEPH BURHOE

Guilty Not Guilty

OREPERSON'S SIGNATURE DATE